

John F. McHugh  
SDNY Bar No. JM 1240  
Attorney at Law  
6 Water St.  
New York, NY 10004  
212-483-0875

Gilbert Gaynor  
Cal. Bar No. 107109  
Attorney at Law  
820 Arguello Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93103-1816  
805-962-5842

Allen Lichtenstein  
Nevada Bar No. 3992  
3315 Russell Road  
Las Vegas, NV 89120  
702-433-2666  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

	)	CV-S-04-1304-RCJ-(LRL)
REDA A. GINENA, NAHID I. GINENA, AMRE	)	
R. GINENA, SABRINA KOBERT, M. MAGDY	)	SECOND AMENDED
H. RASIKH, M. SAMIR MANSOUR, AZZA EID,	)	COMPLAINT AND
NAZMI M. NAZMI, and HEBA NAZMI,	)	JURY DEMAND
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
ALASKA AIRLINES, INC.	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	





1           18. Pursuant to the contract of carriage the defendant was obligated to carry  
2 the plaintiffs via a direct route pursuant to applicable air traffic controls and without  
3 unscheduled and unnecessary and avoidable diversions or delays.

4           19. Plaintiffs' group included several international oil and gas industry  
5 executives. The objective of the plaintiffs' trip was to attend an energy industry  
6 convention in Las Vegas and specifically to attend a meeting that evening, September 29,  
7 2003, for the purpose of making contacts with industry officials in North America, an  
8 opportunity open to them only during that first evening of the convention.

9           20. About one hour into the flight, about 65 miles South East of Reno Nevada,  
10 within the District of Nevada, United States, the defendant's flight crew, without cause or  
11 justification, diverted the airliner from its course and schedule, to an unscheduled landing  
12 in Reno, Nevada.

13           21. At Reno, Nevada the defendant without cause or justification directed the  
14 plaintiffs to leave the aircraft. Thereafter, the defendant refused to carry the plaintiffs on  
15 to their scheduled and contracted destination.

16           22. Defendant's actions were based upon the discriminatory animus of its cabin  
17 crew directed at the plaintiffs, whom the cabin crew perceived to be Arab and Muslim.  
18 After the aircraft was on the ground and the plaintiffs had deplaned, the actions of the  
19 aircraft's crew were ratified and adopted as company policy by the defendant's  
20 management.

21           23. The defendant's flight crew-employees, and after arrival at Reno, the  
22 defendant's corporate personnel acted with animus toward plaintiffs due to the plaintiffs'  
23 race, ethnicity, national origin, and/or religion, or presumed race, ethnicity, national  
24 origin, and/or religion as a matter of company policy.

25           24. Defendant's diversion of the flight and refusal to carry the plaintiffs to their  
26 destination significantly delayed the plaintiffs' passage, without excuse or cause beyond  
27 the defendant's control.  
28

1           25. The plaintiffs' late arrival caused the plaintiffs to miss important business  
2 opportunities and to render their trip and the investment therein wasted, and caused  
3 legally cognizable inconvenience and expenses for substitute air transportation.

4           26. By reason of the above delay, the plaintiffs have been injured in amounts  
5 which cannot be stated with precision at this time. However, as the defendant's actions  
6 were malicious due to unlawful discrimination and constituted willful misconduct, the  
7 limitations of the Warsaw Convention should not apply as to the damages of any of the  
8 plaintiffs which exceed the monetary limits imposed by that treaty for damages due to  
9 delay.

#### 10                                   **DUE DILIGENCE AND TIMELINESS**

11           27. As to the second and fourth through ninth claims for relief set forth herein,  
12 plaintiffs have been diligent in pursuing the wrongs arising from the matters alleged in  
13 the underlying complaint which this complaint amends. Plaintiffs undertook a diligent  
14 pre-filing investigation of this matter, filed this action more than one year prior to the  
15 expiration of the applicable two-year statute of limitations, have complied with all  
16 applicable time limits, and on August 18, 2005, timely sent out discovery requests. If  
17 defendant had timely and properly responded to plaintiffs' discovery requests with the  
18 production of all responsive documents as required by rule 34 of the Federal Rules of  
19 Civil Procedure, such response would have allowed plaintiffs the opportunity to file this  
20 second amended complaint to allege the causes of action alleged herein within the  
21 applicable two-year limitations period for each act of defamation herein alleged and prior  
22 to the expiration of the time period within which to amend the pleading set forth in the  
23 Court's original scheduling order.

24           28. Defendant, by failing to fully respond in a timely manner as required by law  
25 to plaintiffs' first set of requests for production of documents in this action, served by  
26 plaintiffs on August 18, 2005, concealed and suppressed the fact that the malicious  
27 conduct, complained of herein, arising from the transaction which occurred on September  
28

1 29, 2003, continued for several days thereafter, due to the fact that the malice its flight  
2 crew was adopted as company policy by defendant. Defendant failed to provide  
3 documents within the time required by law which would have revealed facts giving rise  
4 to the second and fourth through ninth claims for relief until November 7 and 17 of 2005  
5 when such documents were produced by defendant, after the statute of limitations  
6 relating to this conduct as separate actions expired and after the time set in the Court's  
7 scheduling order had expired.

8 29. Because plaintiffs could not have discovered through the exercise of  
9 reasonable diligence the facts giving rise to the second and fourth through ninth claims  
10 for relief herein, due to defendant's concealment and suppression of the existence and  
11 authorship of the defamatory publications alleged herein, and because the acts of  
12 defamation herein were within defendant's knowledge and plaintiffs had no other  
13 reasonable means of ascertaining those facts, the causes of action did not even accrue,  
14 and the applicable statute of limitations did not even begin to run, under controlling law,  
15 until November 7, 2005 with respect to the second, fifth, sixth and seventh claims for  
16 relief, and until November 17, 2005 with respect to the fourth, eighth and ninth claims for  
17 relief. As the specific acts complained of herein arise out of the conduct, transaction and  
18 occurrences set forth or attempted to be set forth in the original complaint, the second and  
19 fourth through ninth claims for relief relate back to the date of the original complaint.  
20 Accordingly, these causes of action are timely plead.

## 21 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

### 22 **(Defamation)**

23 30. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate each and every allegation contained in  
24 paragraphs 1- 29 as if set forth here in full.

25 31. On or about September 30, 2003 the defendant, maliciously filed a criminal  
26 complaint against the plaintiffs, falsely alleging that they had interfered with the  
27 defendant's flight crew during the flight in question, in violation of 49 U.S.C. § 46504  
28

1 and/or that the plaintiffs were terrorists. As a common carrier by air the defendant is  
2 charged with enforcing the statutes applicable to passengers aboard its aircraft, and had  
3 the obligation to know their terms. Defendant was fully aware, due to being advised of  
4 the conclusion of the Reno-Tahoe Airport Police and the Transportation Security  
5 Administration, that no basis existed to believe plaintiffs had committed a "serious  
6 offence." In addition defendant unreasonably failed to confirm its flight crew's report.  
7 In addition there were no grounds for believing that plaintiffs had violated 49 U.S.C. §  
8 46504, even accepting everything the flight crew reported. Instead of discharging its  
9 responsibilities to the plaintiffs as a common carrier the defendant adopted the  
10 discriminatory animus of its flight crew as a company policy of malice toward the  
11 plaintiffs due to their ethnicity, national origin and religion.

12 32. This criminal complaint was malicious, completely unfounded and was  
13 made due to the race, ethnicity, national origin, and/or religion of the plaintiffs or the  
14 perception thereof by the defendant's employees. It comprised defamation per se.

15 33. As the result of the slander and defamation in the false complaint, a full  
16 investigation of each of the plaintiffs was conducted by the Federal Authorities which, on  
17 information and belief, included an investigation of each plaintiff conducted by local  
18 police or security agencies in their places of citizenship and residence, generating a  
19 record of each plaintiff as a possible terrorist.

20 34. As the result of that complaint the plaintiffs were taken into custody,  
21 marched through a crowded public lobby and then interviewed at length by law  
22 enforcement representatives at their lodgings at the Bellagio Hotel in Las Vegas  
23 subjecting them to further humiliation and, further diverting them from the business  
24 purposes of their trip, and plaintiffs were questioned at length about activities on the  
25 aircraft, and about specific activities knowable only as the result of investigations  
26 conducted at the plaintiffs' places of citizenship and residence.

1           35. By reason of the above the plaintiffs have been harassed, their reputations  
2 have been injured, and they have been caused to limit all travel to the United States to  
3 that necessitated by business, barring all plaintiffs from all the benefits available to  
4 visitors of their economic means within the United States. Additionally, plaintiffs have  
5 suffered emotional distress.

6           36. By reason of the above each plaintiff has been damaged in a sum which is  
7 estimated to exceed the jurisdictional limits of this court. Further, and in light of the fact  
8 that the false report was due to discrimination against the plaintiffs based on race,  
9 national origin, ethnicity and/or religion, the defendant's actions were malicious,  
10 fraudulent and oppressive, and the plaintiffs should be entitled to an award of punitive  
11 damages in a sum to be set by the jury.

### 12                           **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### 13                                   **(Defamation)**

14           37. Plaintiffs reallege and restate each and every allegation contained in  
15 paragraphs 1-36 as if set forth here in full.

16           38. In addition to persisting in filing a false report of a crime against the  
17 plaintiffs, as a part of the same transaction and in a continuation of the conduct arising  
18 there from, the defendant's personnel made an announcement to all passengers on the  
19 aircraft that the flight had been diverted and delayed due to a disturbance created by the  
20 plaintiffs. That announcement was made after the results of the initial investigation were  
21 known and at a time when the defendant's crewmembers were well aware that no  
22 disturbance had occurred which justified any diversion of the flight and that the incident  
23 was traceable solely to the discriminatory actions of the cabin crew of the aircraft. The  
24 announcement occurred after the aircraft had returned to the air without the plaintiffs.

25           39. The actions of the defendant's employees were caused by animosity  
26 directed at the plaintiffs' predominant ethnic and religious group, Arab and Muslim.  
27  
28





1 interfere with plaintiffs' lawful passage to their original, contracted destination of Las  
2 Vegas.

3 45. As a proximate result of the above-described publication, plaintiffs have  
4 suffered loss to reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation and hurt feelings, all to their  
5 general damage.

6 46. The above-described publication was published by the defendant with malice,  
7 oppression and fraud, as alleged above, and thus plaintiffs seek punitive or exemplary  
8 damages.

### 9 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### 10 **(Defamation)**

11 47. Plaintiffs reallege and restate each and every allegation contained in  
12 paragraphs 1-46 above as if set forth here in full.

13 48. On or about September 30, 2003, defendant's Director of Security, Angela  
14 Kelly, published an e-mail to Mary Ryding and John Severski, also management  
15 employees of defendant, stating in pertinent part: "It shocks me as to why the police  
16 don't follow-up on interference with a flight crew."

17 49. This statement comprised defamation per se, as it falsely imputed to plaintiffs  
18 interference with a flight crew that was criminal in nature.

19 50. The defamation was published with malice, animosity, hatred, spite and ill  
20 will toward plaintiffs, and with the knowledge that it was false and without any  
21 reasonable grounds for believing it was true, and defendant knew that competent  
22 authorities had investigated the matter and determined there was no cause to believe that  
23 plaintiffs had committed any crime. Moreover, any reasonable investigation conducted  
24 by defendant would have only confirmed this conclusion.

25 51. As a proximate result of the above-described publication, plaintiffs have  
26 suffered loss to reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation and hurt feelings, all to their  
27 general damage.  
28

1           52. The above-described publication was published by the defendant with malice,  
2 oppression and fraud, as alleged above, and thus plaintiffs seek punitive or exemplary  
3 damages.

4                           **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5                                   **(Defamation)**

6           53. Plaintiffs reallege and restate each and every allegation contained in  
7 paragraphs 1-52 above as if set forth here in full.

8           54. On or about September 30, 2003, an executive of defendant, Mary Ryding,  
9 published an e-mail to other employees of defendant, stating in pertinent part: “. . . these  
10 are federal crimes and the federal agencies would need to be involved.”

11           55. This statement comprised defamation per se, as it falsely imputed to plaintiffs  
12 interference with a flight crew that was criminal in nature.

13           56. The defamation was published with malice, animosity, hatred, spite and ill  
14 will toward plaintiffs, and with the knowledge that it was false and without any  
15 reasonable grounds for believing it was true, and defendant knew that competent  
16 authorities had investigated the matter and determined there was no cause to believe that  
17 plaintiffs had committed any crime. Moreover, any reasonable investigation conducted  
18 by defendant would have only confirmed this conclusion.

19           57. As a proximate result of the above-described publication, plaintiffs have  
20 suffered loss to reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation and hurt feelings, all to their  
21 general damage.

22           58. The above-described publication was published by the defendant with malice,  
23 oppression and fraud, as alleged above, and thus plaintiffs seek punitive or exemplary  
24 damages.

25                           **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

26                                   **(Defamation)**



1 “the TSA and the Reno Airport Police concluded that this was a violation of FAA civil  
2 laws only.” The statement was untrue, as the Reno Airport Police did not conclude at any  
3 time that the passengers had violated any FAA civil laws whatsoever, and informed the  
4 Captain only that this was “a civil matter.” The newsletter further stated, in pertinent  
5 part, “I know many of us feel let down because these people were not arrested and also  
6 puzzled and dismayed by the ability these same passengers had as they proceeded to  
7 another airline, bought tickets and flew to their original destination.” This statement  
8 comprised defamation per se, as it falsely imputed to plaintiffs the commission of a crime  
9 warranting arrest. The newsletter further stated that “the FBI . . . believes these  
10 passengers also violated federal law”. If the FBI did indeed opine as stated, that was a  
11 republication of the defamation first published by defendant’s flight attendants, and was  
12 completely false.

13 67. The defamation was published with malice, animosity, hatred, spite and ill  
14 will toward plaintiffs, and with the knowledge that it was false and without any  
15 reasonable grounds for believing it was true, and defendant knew that competent  
16 authorities had investigated the matter and determined there was no cause to believe that  
17 plaintiffs had committed any crime. Moreover, any reasonable investigation conducted  
18 by defendant would have only confirmed this conclusion.

19 68. As a proximate result of the above-described publication, plaintiffs have  
20 suffered loss to reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation and hurt feelings, all to their  
21 general damage.

22 69. The above-described publication was published by the defendant with malice,  
23 oppression and fraud, as alleged above, and thus plaintiffs seek punitive or exemplary  
24 damages.

25 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

26 **(Defamation)**

1           70. Plaintiffs reallege and restate each and every allegation contained in  
2 paragraphs 1-69 above as if set forth here in full.

3           71. On October 3, 2003 the defendant re-published the "Chief Pilot Newsletter"  
4 of October 2, 2003. After stating that the Reno Airport Police and the TSA "did gather  
5 all the pertinent information," the republished newsletter stated, "the TSA and the Reno  
6 Airport Police concluded that this was a violation of FAA civil laws only." The  
7 statement was untrue, as the Reno Airport Police did not conclude at any time that the  
8 passengers had violated any FAA civil laws whatsoever, and informed the Captain only  
9 that this was "a civil matter." The newsletter further stated, in pertinent part, "I know  
10 many of us feel let down because these people were not arrested and also puzzled and  
11 dismayed by the ability these same passengers had as they proceeded to another airline,  
12 bought tickets and flew to their original destination." This statement comprised  
13 defamation per se, as it falsely imputed to plaintiffs the commission of a crime  
14 warranting arrest.

15           72. The defamation was published with malice, animosity, hatred, spite and ill  
16 will toward plaintiffs, and with the knowledge that it was false and without any  
17 reasonable grounds for believing it was true, and defendant knew that competent  
18 authorities had investigated the matter and determined there was no cause to believe that  
19 plaintiffs had committed any crime. Moreover, any reasonable investigation conducted  
20 by defendant would have only confirmed this conclusion.

21           74. As a proximate result of the above-described publication, plaintiffs have  
22 suffered loss to reputation, shame, mortification, humiliation and hurt feelings, all to their  
23 general damage.

24           75. The above-described publication was published by the defendant with malice,  
25 oppression and fraud, as alleged above, and thus plaintiffs seek punitive or exemplary  
26 damages.

**PRAYER**

Wherefore, the plaintiffs demand judgment in their favor and against the defendant:

**ON THE FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

1. For such sum as established by each plaintiff being their individual costs and wasted investment in their trip to Las Vegas, for legally cognizable inconvenience, for costs of substitute transportation, and for such other damages for delay as may be established at trial.

**ON THE SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

2. For general damages, and for special damages in such sum as is established, including all costs and fees incurred due to the malicious false charge as well as damages for defamation per se, and damages for injury done to plaintiffs' personal reputations, businesses and ability to freely travel, for emotional distress, and for an award of punitive damages in a sum to be established by the jury.

**ON THE THIRD THROUGH NINTH CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

3. For general damages, and for special damages in such sum as is established, including damages for defamation per se, and damages for injury done to plaintiffs' personal reputations, for emotional distress, and for an award of punitive damages in a sum to be established by the jury.

**ON ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

4. The costs and disbursements of this action, and any further relief provided by the applicable law.

DATE; June 4, 2011

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

/s/ Allen Lichtenstein

John F. McHugh  
SDNY Bar No. JM 1240

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
Attorney at Law  
6 Water St.  
New York, NY 10004  
212-483-0875

Gilbert Gaynor  
Cal. Bar No. 107109  
Attorney at Law  
820 Arguello Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93103-1816  
805-962-5842

Allen Lichtenstein  
Nevada Bar No. 3992  
3315 Russell Road  
Las Vegas, NV 89120  
702-433-2666



**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs request trial by jury.

DATE; June 4, 2011,

/s/ Allen Lichtenstein

John F. McHugh  
SDNY Bar No. JM 1240

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
Attorney at Law  
6 Water St.  
New York, NY 10004  
212-483-0875

Gilbert Gaynor  
Cal. Bar No. 107109  
Attorney at Law  
820 Arguello Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93103-1816  
805-962-5842

Allen Lichtenstein  
Nevada Bar No. 3992  
3315 Russell Road  
Las Vegas, NV 89120  
702-433-2666